

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on October 2, 2008 Examiner Spooner rejected claims 1-33. Claims 1, 15 and 27 have been amended herein. Based on the amendments made herein and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Application.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments

The Examiner indicated that rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been overcome by Applicant's arguments. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this determination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicated that the element of "repeating said applying, said determining and setting" does not incorporate the "modified current target language translation", and asserted that this renders the claim unclear. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "repeating said applying, said determining and said setting **for the modified current target language translation.**" (emphasis added) Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome and requests the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 15, the Examiner indicated that the element "said setting" lacks antecedent basis and that it is unclear whether "iteratively modifying *a* target language translation of *a* source language text" are intended to relate to elements recited earlier in the claim. Applicant has amended claim 15 to change "said setting" to "said iteratively modifying." Applicant has further amended claim 15 to recite "iteratively modifying the current target language translation of the source language text segment" thus clarifying the

referenced elements. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 15 has been overcome and requests the rejection to claim 15 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 27, the Examiner asserts that “generate an initial translation as an initial current target language translation” is confusing and that a process loop “and to repeat” is grammatically confusing. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “generate an initial translation as a current target language translation.” Applicant has further amended claim 27 to recite, among other limitations, “a process loop configured to iteratively modify the *current target language translation* [...] based on the *probability module estimate of the probability* of correctness [...] and the *probability module determination* [....].” (emphasis added) Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 27 has been overcome and requests the rejection to claim 27 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 2-14, 16-26 and 28-33 depend from allowable claims 1, 15 and 27, respectfully, and should be patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believes the rejection to the claims has been overcome, and that the present Application is in condition for allowance.

If Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative via telephone to discuss placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Marcu

Date: January 2, 2009

By: /Steve Bachmann/
Steve Bachmann, Reg. No. 50,806
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444